

**SEP 27 2005**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK**  
**U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

RANDALL DEAN LAMARR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF OREGON, acting by and  
through, Baker County Circuit Court; et  
al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 04-35393

D.C. No. CV-04-06041-AS

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Oregon  
Ancer L. Haggerty, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 12, 2005<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: REINHARDT, RYMER, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Randall Dean Lamarr, an Oregon state prisoner, appeals pro se the

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

district court's dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) of his 42 U.S.C.

§ 1983 action against County Court employees alleging that defendants failed to act on his application to proceed in forma pauperis, resulting in the dismissal of his state court action. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a dismissal based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, *Bianchi v.*

*Rylaarsdam*, 334 F.3d 895, 898 (9th Cir. 2003), and we affirm.

The district court properly dismissed this action pursuant to the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine because the gravamen of Lamarr's complaint requires federal review of the state court ruling against him. *See id.* at 898 (federal district courts are not authorized to review state court judgments). Because Lamarr's constitutional claims are "inextricably intertwined" with the substance of the state court decision, review of such claims is also barred under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *See id.*

**AFFIRMED.**